

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/816,080 04/01/2004		Marek Matusz	TH-0996 (US)	8885
23632 SHELL OIL C	7590 01/31/2007 OMPANY		EXAMINER	
P O BOX 2463		COVINGTON, RAYMOND K		
HOUSTON, T	X 772522463		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1625	
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE MAIL DATE		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
3 MONTHS		01/31/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summany		Appl	Application No. Applicant(s)					
		10/8	16,080	MATUSZ ET AL.				
Office Action Summary			niner	Art Unit				
-· <u></u>			mond Covington	1625	_			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this commun or Reply	nication appears o	on the cover sheet	with the correspondence ad	ldress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE N nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this common period for reply is specified above, the maximum state to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	MAILING DATE O s of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In munication. tatutory period will apply y will, by statute, cause the	F THIS COMMUN no event, however, may and will expire SIX (6) Mo the application to become	IICATION. a reply be timely filed ONTHS from the mailing date of this c ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	•			
Status								
	Responsive to communication(s) file	ad an 21 October	2006					
2a)□				•				
3)□	· _							
الــا(د	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
	closed in accordance with the pract	ice under Ex pari	e Quayle, 1955 C	.D. 11, 455 O.G. 213.				
Dispositi	on of Claims							
4)🖂	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the	application.						
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/a	are withdrawn from	n consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
6)🖂	Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.	•						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.							
8)□	Claim(s) are subject to restrict	ction and/or elect	ion requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers		·					
	The specification is objected to by th	o Evaminor						
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are		or h) Cohinatad t	n hu tha Evancinas				
יייייי			· -	- '				
	Applicant may not request that any obje		- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	• • •	ED 4 4047 N			
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including The oath or declaration is objected to							
		o by the Examine	i. Note the attach	ed Office Action of form Fi	0-132.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).								
a)[☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.							
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No							
	3. Copies of the certified copies	of the priority do	cuments have bee	n received in this National	Stage			
	application from the Internation	onal Bureau (PCT	Rule 17.2(a)).					
* S	see the attached detailed Office action	on for a list of the	certified copies no	ot received.				
	•							
Attachmen	(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Intension	Summary (PTO-413)				
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-948)		o(s)/Mail Date				
3) 🔯 Inforr	nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)	·		Informal Patent Application				
Pape	r No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/31/06</u> .		6)					

Art Unit: 1625

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lauritzen et al US 4808738 in view of Shell WO 95/17957, Evans et al US 5418202, and Lauritzen et al EP 00352850 in further view of Habenschuss et al CA 1286687, Baker et al EP 1458698, Carlson CA 488990 and Evans WO 01/96324.

Lauritzen et al US 4808738, Shell WO 95/17957, Evans et al US 5418202, and Lauritzen et al EP 00352850 are applied as in the previous office action.

Applicants argue 1) that the references do not teach that there is a loss of catalyst activity and that the reaction temperature is raised to at least partly reduce the loss of activity. Applicants also argue 2) that the art teach teaches only increasing the amount of halohydrocarbon as opposed to maintaining the relative quantity of halohydrocarbon. Lastly applicants argue 3) that rheium is not present in the prior art catalyst within the recited range.

As to 1) above, it is noted that it is well recognized that "reaction systems generally deactivate over time, i.e., the activity of the catalyst begins to decrease as the process is carried out." To overcome this it is known increase the temperature of the reaction at a rate to maintain a given activity. See Habenschuss et al CA 1286687 page 6 last paragraph and page 7 first paragraph. See also Carlson CA 488990 page 4 lines 18-24. To apply this well-known technique to an otherwise known process would have been obvious as the results would not have been unexpected.

As to 2) above, it is noted that halohydrocarbons, e.g., chlorohydrocarbon are well-known as moderators for catalysts used in olefin epoxidation processes corresponding to those recited in the claims. See, for example. Evans WO 01/96324 page 8 lines 11-21. It is also noted that Evans teaches continuously adjusting the chlorohydrocarbon during the reaction to maintain a certain activity level. The same is also taught by Carlson CA 488990. See page 4 lines 10-12.

As to 3) above rheium corresponding to that recited in the claims was noted in the previous office action. Catalyst containing a rheium component in the recited amounts with a support corresponding to the type recited in the claims would inherently have the claimed surface area ratio.

No claim is allowed.

Art Unit: 1625

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Raymond Covington whose telephone number is (571) 272-0681. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas McKenzie at telephone number (571) 272-0681.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

homes McKenzie

SPE

Art Unit 1625

/e RKC